

Draft Individual Review Form

Proposal number: 2001-I212-2

**Short Proposal Title: Next Phase Funding
for Expanding California Salmon Habitat
Through Non-regulatory Mechanisms to Alter
Dams and Diversions**

1a) Are the objectives and hypotheses clearly stated?

Yes, the four key educational objectives are clearly spelled out and fulfillment of these objectives would directly work to help solve the problem described clearly in the proposal. The problem being the critical situation that Californians face with the scheduled 2001 divestiture of the PG&E hydroelectric facilities and the uncertain future management of those watersheds and subsequent impacts to downstream ecosystems and CalFed projects. There are two hypotheses being tested with regards to public and focused policy education and decision-making. Both are soundly described by the proponent and are feasible to be tested, since this project will have an immediate outcome and decisions about the divestiture will be made within the next 12 months.

1b1) Does the conceptual model clearly explain the underlying basis for the proposed work?

Yes, the conceptual model lays out two distinct alternative decisions that can be made in the next year regarding the PG&E auction and illustrates the impact that this education project can have on one or both of those alternatives. The alternative strongly favored by the proponent is the Consumers' Authority Acquisition, which is approval through the State Legislature to allow the State interim purchase of the facilities. This option is most highly affected by the project, however both alternatives would be greatly improved if this educational campaign was to be funded. The conceptual model is further illustrated (Figure 2) to allow for adaptive management of the project. Feedback loops for project action and direction are incorporated at every step.

1b2) Is the approach well designed and appropriate for meeting the objectives of the project?

Yes, this is a Next-Phase project which is designed to build on the five basic features of the first phase of the project. Those features are clearly described and collectively combine to make a tight project. In this second phase program, the structure of the project will remain the same and continuity with the original program seems to be well orchestrated. There won't need to be an initial orientation, but rather an on-going educational effort. I believe that this educational approach is well thought out and I know that the proponent has experience and a solid track record in this type of work and is capable of achieving the goals and objectives of the project. The final outcome of the divestiture however, remains a decision for the Legislature and the people of California to make.

1c1) Has the applicant justified the selection of research, pilot or demonstration project, or a full-scale implementation project?

Yes, the applicant proposes a full-scale implementation project that is well justified. The first phase of the project was a full-scale implementation project as well.

1c2) Is the project likely to generate information that can be used to inform future decision making?

Absolutely. That is the primary and principle goal of the project- to inform and influence the legislature, decision makers, the PUC and the people of California in regards to the future of these PG&E facilities, the environmental consequences of divestitures and the options that we face in attempting to protect the watersheds and associated restoration projects both within and downstream of those watersheds.

2a) Are the monitoring and information assessment plans adequate to assess the outcome of the project?

Yes, the project incorporates milestones at various points along the way, which coordinate with decision makers schedule and hearings on this matter. The adaptive management concept for the project is based on feedback of information that will be derived from these information and monitoring efforts. On a larger scale, the success of the project will be monitored at the time of decision making and at various decision making points along the way.

2b) Are data collection, data management, data analysis, and reporting plans well-described, scientifically sound and adequate to meet the proposed objectives?

During the first phase of the project, data in the form of electronic and hard copy has been published and widely distributed amongst a broad group of stakeholders. This same method of sharing of information will continue during this next phase

3) Is the proposed work likely to be technically feasible?

I believe that the Institute for Fisheries Resources has the institutional capacity and professional, talented staff to complete this project. The type of educational campaign that is being proposed is highly feasible and the success of the first phase of the project proves that it can be carried out.

4) Is the proposed project team qualified to efficiently and effectively implement the proposed project?

I have reviewed Dr. Philip Guy, the principle proponent's qualifications, and he appears to be quite capable of conducting this campaign. I have professional knowledge of the reputation of the work of the Institute for Fisheries Resources and believe that there is no other organization equally qualified to complete this work.

Miscellaneous comments

Overall Evaluation	Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating
	I would have to give this project a 100% APPROVAL RATING. This is a subject that I am familiar with enough to know how critical this issue is to the future of the Bay-Delta and surrounding watersheds as well as to the success of other CalFed projects. The project has been time-tested for a year and has a solid track record for providing the educational services that are critically needed on this subject. It is a need that is expressed within an extremely limited timeframe, thus making it possible to achieve real success within a short period of time. It is also a multiplier project, in that with so little financing, so much watershed land and downstream ecosystem can be protected. Wholehearted support the funding of this project.

Summary Rating

- ☐ Excellent- I rate this an Excellent project
 - ☐ Very Good
 - ☐ Good
 - ☐ Fair
 - ☐ Poor
-